



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/503,037	02/11/2000	Joseph Korb	84582.1000	6037

7590

07/20/2006

James E Marina Esq
Winston & Strawn
200 Park Avenue
New York, NY 10166

EXAMINER

AVELLINO, JOSEPH E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2143

DATE MAILED: 07/20/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/503,037

Applicant(s)

KORB ET AL.

Examiner

Joseph E. Avellino

Art Unit

2143

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 June 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 52-79 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 52-79 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 52-79 are presented for examination; claims 52 and 60 independent. The Office acknowledges the cancellation of claims 1-51.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 52-67, 71-73, and 77-79 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fox et al. (Adapting to Network and Client Variability via On-Demand Dynamic Distillation; ACM, October 1996) (cited by Applicant in IDS) (hereinafter Fox) in view of Himmel (USPN 6,167,441).

3. Referring to claim 52, Fox discloses a web server (i.e. proxy) for transferring data from the internet (i.e. servers) to mobile wireless devices (i.e. clients) that have limited display capabilities (p. 160), comprising:

a web server (i.e. proxy) that is connected to wireless devices (i.e. clients) via one or more corresponding wireless communications networks (i.e. network client is connected through), and is also connected to the Internet (i.e. connected to the server) (p. 162, see figure), and

wherein the web server is further configured to:

receive requests from users of the wireless devices to view Internet web pages, wherein the requests are received in accordance with a transport protocol used by a requesting wireless device in its corresponding wireless communications network (it is inherent that in order for a device to communicate, it must utilize a transport protocol) (p. 162 section 2.1);

reformat the requests into HTTP requests (p. 167: "Pythia HTTP Proxy");

send the HTTP requests to destination devices on the Internet in accordance with an Internet transport protocol (p. 162, section 2.1: "retrieve content from Internet servers on the client's behalf");

receive the requested web pages from the destination servers (p. 162, section 2.1: "retrieve content from Internet servers on the client's behalf");

parse data elements contained in the received web pages and remove non-displayable data elements (i.e. distilling) from the web pages to generate displayable web pages based on the wireless device type of the requesting device (p. 162, sections 2.1-2.2: "determine which distillation engines must be employed...if the client has an 8-bit grey-scale display..."), and

send the web pages, without including the removed data elements, over the wireless communications networks to the requesting wireless

Art Unit: 2143

device (p. 160, section 1: "data-type specific lossy compression"; p. 161 section 1.4: "provide the best possible service to all clients").

Fox does not explicitly state that the client's transport protocol includes an element which identifies the type of wireless device that is making the request. In analogous art, Himmel discloses another web server which transfers data from the Internet to a client device, which discloses an element which identifies the type of wireless device that is making the request (i.e. "browser identification and level from which device capabilities can be inferred") (col. 2, lines 40-45). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Himmel with Fox since Fox discloses that the proxy knows the device type and capabilities of the client device, however does not specifically state how this information is known to the proxy server. This would motivate one of ordinary skill in the art to search the art for other proxy systems which determine the device type and capabilities of the requesting device, eventually finding Himmel and its novel method of pulling this information from the HTTP header (col. 2, lines 30-45).

4. Referring to claim 53, Fox in view of Himmel discloses the transport protocol includes the wireless device type (Himmel: col. 2, lines 40-45).

Art Unit: 2143

5. Referring to claim 54, Fox in view of Himmel discloses the server determines the device type to be the type of device identified in the transport protocol (Himmel: col. 2, lines 40-45).

6. Referring to claims 55-57, Fox in view of Himmel disclose the invention substantially as claimed. Fox in view of Himmel further disclose reformatting the request into HTTP requests (Fox: p. 167, section 4), removing non-displayable data elements (see rejection above, and reformat a requested web page by building tags containing remaining data elements (i.e. compress web page) (Fox: p. 165). Fox in view of Himmel does not specifically disclose that this is done by a child process, however it is well known that web servers are multithreaded, being able to handle multiple requests at once and executing multiple tasks at the same time. By this rationale, "Official Notice" is taken that both the concept and advantages of providing for a child or helper process to take care of various tasks on the server is well known and expected in the art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Fox-Himmel to have child processes provide task execution in order to free up the web server thread to receive requests for data and to send data back to the clients, greatly freeing up computing resources as well as improving the overall throughput of the proxy server system of Fox-Himmel.

7. Referring to claim 58, Fox-Himmel discloses the server compresses and encrypts (the Office construes the term "encrypts" as "changing or modifying at least one bit of

Art Unit: 2143

data", as such compression of the data can be considered encryption) the web page (i.e. Gzip compression) (Fox: p. 165, col. 1).

8. Referring to claim 59, Fox-Himmel discloses generating a plurality of data packets for sending the data elements to the device (i.e. HTTP inherently packetizes the data to be transmitted over the network) (p. 168, section 5.1).

9. Claims 60-67, 71-73, and 77-79 are rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

Claims 68, 69, 74, and 75 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fox-Himmel in view of Edholm (US 2003/0067940).

10. Referring to claims 68 and 69, Fox-Himmel discloses the invention substantively as described in the claims above. Fox-Himmel does not specifically disclose pacing the transmission of the data packets based on a bandwidth capability of the network. In analogous art, Edholm discloses another method for transferring data from the internet to a client device which discloses pacing the transmission of the data packets based on a bandwidth capability of the network (i.e. threshold bandwidth based on the receiving capabilities of a client device) (e.g. abstract). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teaching of Edholm with Fox-Himmel in order to reduce the need for flow control signals and large buffers in the client devices as supported by Edholm (p. 1, ¶ 7-8).

11. Claims 74 and 75 are rejected for similar reasons as stated above..

Claims 70 and 76 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fox-Himmel in view of Hedin et al. (USPN 6,185,535) (hereinafter Hedin).

12. Referring to claim 70, Fox-Himmel discloses the invention substantively as described in the claims above. Fox-Himmel does not specifically disclose converting web pages from HTML to another tag language. In analogous art, Hedin discloses another method for transferring data from a server to a client which discloses converting HTML into WML (i.e. another tag language) (col. 5, lines 45-55). it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Hedin with Fox-Himmel in order to conform the web page to the specifics of the device type, resulting in a web page which can be displayed to a user on the low power device as supported by Hedin (col. 5, lines 50-55).

13. Claim 76 is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

Response to Arguments

14. The Office has considered the Affidavit, submitted June 19, 2006. It is sufficient to overcome the Mousseau, Kadyk, and Landgren references.

Art Unit: 2143

15. A new grounds of rejection has been presented above.

Conclusion

16. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joseph E. Avellino whose telephone number is (571) 272-3905. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 7:00-4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David A. Wiley can be reached on (571) 272-3923. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2143

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Joseph E. Avellino, Examiner
July 11, 2006